

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorial—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 150 Nassau Street, New York. Rogers, Vice President; R. H. Walden, Secretary; F. A. Butler, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, 150 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$10.00; 6 months, \$6.00; 3 months, \$3.50.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$12.00; 6 months, \$8.00; 3 months, \$5.00.
Sunday only, 1 year, \$4.00; 6 months, \$2.50; 3 months, \$1.50.

FOREIGN RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$15.00; 6 months, \$10.00; 3 months, \$6.00.
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, \$18.00; 6 months, \$12.00; 3 months, \$7.50.
Sunday only, 1 year, \$6.00; 6 months, \$4.00; 3 months, \$2.50.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Too Proud to Speak?

Are the people of this country to be compelled to choose between a candidate who was "too proud to fight" and one who was too proud to speak?

Carranza's Plain Questions.

The Administration has good reason to be worried over General Carranza's latest note. Carranza is an accomplished and resourceful diplomatist. He has got the better of every discussion which he has carried on with our State Department. At the close of the last encounter our government recognized him unconditionally as the head of the *de facto* Mexican Government, although it had at the outset served an ultimatum on him requiring him to relinquish the Provisional Presidency and to obligate himself not to be a candidate for President at the first election following a restoration of order. General Carranza is a hard man to deal with because he is not to be put off with ambiguous phrases. He does not allow an opponent to straddle a diplomatic fence. He insists on keeping the record straight, and that is the one thing at which the diplomacy of this Administration is least apt.

It has been admitted in Washington that President Wilson misled the country when he gave it the impression that United States troops had gone into Mexico after the Columbus raid with the permission of Carranza's government. Carranza never gave any permit of that sort. All that he did, as the correspondence shows, was to approve the idea of drafting a protocol permitting each government in the future to send troops across the boundary line in pursuit of bandits. That protocol has never been completed or signed. Our troops are therefore in Mexico without Mexico's acquiescence and in defiance of the wishes of the Mexican people and of the *de facto* government.

President Wilson has never publicly abandoned the fiction that he sent General Pershing's expedition across the border in consequence of an understanding with Mexico. He still maintains that he is not violating Mexican sovereignty. He says that the United States stands for the territorial integrity and political independence of all existing nations. Yet he has failed to explain to General Carranza why he himself continues to violate Mexican sovereignty.

Carranza rightly says that the hunt for Villa has collapsed. Why, then, are the American troops in Mexico not withdrawn? It is a plain question which demands a plain answer. But Mr. Wilson is not willing to give such an answer, because he hates to dispel the illusion that he entered Mexico with ample diplomatic warrant and to admit to the world that the operations conducted by General Pershing have been anything but a thinly disguised form of war.

Our troops have no status in Mexico except that of invaders, going there to accomplish a purpose which the United States believes Carranza's government is unable to accomplish. Carranza says that there is nothing left for American soldiers to do on Mexican soil, and that to keep them there longer will demonstrate the hostile intentions of the United States. How is that clear and accurate statement of the Mexican point of view to be met?

For reasons connected with domestic politics the President is reluctant to withdraw the army from Mexico. But as a world-wide humanitarian and pacificator he is firmly committed to withdrawing them. What will the outcome be? Will he reject in his own case the philosophy which he has prescribed for Europe, simply because he fears to run counter to American feeling and to weaken himself as a Presidential candidate?

Responsibility for Crime.

An unusual and encouraging circumstance in the murder trial so quickly disposed of last week was that there was little controversy or hairsplitting among the physicians called upon to give testimony concerning the mental state of the prisoner. The plea of moral imbecility—the most favorable that could be found by those employed for the defence—was dismissed by Justice Shearn as irrelevant. The question for the jury was whether the prisoner understood the nature and quality of his act.

By way of simplifying the jury's task, the justice recalled the manner in which Walto procured a supply of arsenic, remarking pointedly that "if he thought it something pleasant to eat he would not know the nature of his act." While advising the twelve men duly to weigh the opinions of the physicians, he made it plain that it was not their duty, nor were they competent, to act as a board of psychiatrists.

The case was unusually clear, and it would therefore be rash to assume that

it marks a turn for the better in dealing with criminal cases complicated by the plea of insanity. It was one of those cases that could be tested by the application of a comparatively simple formula. There have been many other instances in which the application of the same formula would be more questionable. Dr. Mercier, who has given much thought to the reform of criminal law, has cited a number of perplexing cases that have been tried in English courts. One will suffice as an example. A man was convicted of the murder of his sister, whom he had killed because she had passed him in the street unnoticed. He was doubtless insane and morally irresponsible, but he knew the nature and quality of his act, and he knew that he was liable to die for it, and upon a strict application of an inadequate formula he was duly found guilty.

It was in respect of many similar cases that the committee on crime and punishment at the last meeting of the British Medical Association recommended that full responsibility in a criminal should be recognized only when it had been demonstrated that the accused person knew and appreciated the nature, quality and wrongness of his act and the circumstances in which it was done.

Park Vandalism.

The combination of holiday and fine weather filled the city's parks on Decoration Day. Yesterday the deplorable results were apparent, especially in Central Park. Rubbish and waste paper littered the lawns, imposing a considerable expense on the taxpayers for the necessary cleaning-up process.

Year after year New York's heavy investment in its splendid park system has been shabbily treated by the people who use it. Park Commissioner Ward, much stirred up over such vandalism, recently attributed it to "half-baked Americanism," declaring: "These people sing our national anthem; they talk glibly of liberty; they join in our Fourth of July celebration; but they appear to be wholly ignorant of the fact that liberty means the opportunity to give the other fellow the same chance you enjoy yourself. They destroy the young trees in the park. They fill big areas with rubbish. They refuse to cooperate with the authorities in their efforts to give to the people wholesome recreation grounds."

Similar indictments have been drawn in other years against the East Siders and residents of other sections with heavy foreign population. And while it is probably true that the people from these districts are responsible for most of the damage done, it is entirely possible that the fault is not theirs alone. The neighboring city of Newark has a large foreign population, of approximately the same elements as those most in evidence here. Newark also has some fine parks, highly popular and extensively used. They do not seem to suffer at the hands of vandals as do the parks here. That may be because of a systematic campaign of education regarding them, the keynote of which was that any person who injured park property was damaging property of which he was part owner. The park authorities here have tried that scheme, but it may be they have not tried it hard enough or long enough. It is worth trying on a large scale, with the cooperation of every settlement worker and playground instructor whose services can be impressed.

Beyond that there should unquestionably be a constant, relentless campaign against the vandals by the police. If an offense of that nature is due to ignorance or mere carelessness, a warning by the officer of the law is usually enough to prevent its repetition. But there should be no hesitation to stamp out vicious disregard of the public's interests by arrests and adequate punishment in court.

Working-Class Internationalism.

The final appointment of a Socialist to the Berlin Food Regulation Board does not mean that German bureaucracy is becoming democratic. It means rather that German Socialism is becoming imperialist. Official Prussia would never in such a crisis risk placing power in the hands of one who was not perfectly safe. The appointment of a solitary Socialist would seem a niggardly recognition of the patriotic loyalty of the Socialists. But its acceptance would indicate that no small number of these "radicals" were willing enough to make peace with the government.

It appears that, with the exception of the group who have stood with Liebknecht, the Social Democratic party of the Fatherland has of late turned out something of a disappointment to "comrades" in other countries. This war has shown how great has been the transformation in the Socialist movement since the days when certain German radicals were exploring Marx to aid the French Communists in a proposed quixotic invasion of the Fatherland for the purpose of liberating the Teutonic working class.

Beginning as a class conscious revolutionary movement, Continental Socialism has in a half century become hardly more than the parliamentary expression of the political interests of labor. From fulminations and manifestos of hostility to all "masters" and "tyrants" it changes now to guarded protestations of loyalty to the warring German empires. From a position of uncompromising internationalism, it turns to discover economic reasons why German workingmen should give their devotion to the Fatherland, and go out to shoot the workmen of France and England. The collapse of Socialism as an international force in the first crucial test of war may be only what should have been expected, but it was Socialism's lost opportunity, and it has disillusioned many who looked to the labor movement to preserve the peace of Europe. Patriotism has proved stronger than class consciousness.

Nationalism has prevailed over doctrinaire theories of universal brotherhood. If the brotherhood of nations is ever to be realized, few will now seriously expect it to come through the artificial internationalism of a particular class movement, but through such a spirit of friendship of nation for nation as is expressed by the Russian Minister Sazonoff, who assures us that the alliance made by the governments of England, France and Russia has now become an alliance of the hearts of the people, a bond of union forever.

Doctor Shakespeare.

While we are observing the tercentenary of Shakespeare's death it is very proper that we should be reminded of the amazing diversity of his knowledge and understanding. But really the theme is pretty well played out already, and it is unreasonable to expect to dig up new texts proving that he knew or foresaw everything that has been discovered since his time. When commentators try to do so they are forced either to squeeze more meaning out of his sentences than they obviously bear or to treat more commonplaces as astonishing flashes of genius.

Dr. James Frederick Rogers discusses Shakespeare's work as a health teacher in "The Scientific Monthly." There are many excellent observations on health in the plays, but consider them apart from the delightful diction and many of the passages quoted by Dr. Rogers show no extraordinary knowledge or insight. Shakespeare condemned drunkenness and gluttony, but he was not the first to recognize the evils of over-eating and over-drinking. Dr. Rogers quotes a passage from "Coriolanus" (1606) on "the interdependence and need of harmony among the organs of the body," and asks whether Shakespeare had read Cervantes and had in mind the maxim that "the health of the whole body is tempered in the laboratory of the stomach." But the fable of the rebellious members was familiar long before 1606. It is a little far-fetched, too, to say that when Lady Macbeth's medical adviser declares she needs a divine more than a physician he "foreshadows, by three centuries, the general popular and professional agitation concerning the value of mental treatment of nervous disorders."

If we are to go as far as this we may as well go further and agree with the enthusiast who proved that Shakespeare was a thoroughgoing Freudian, that Hamlet is a plain example of the "Oedipus complex" and that Lady Macbeth was intended to demonstrate the latest Viennese theories of the psychoneuroses. If that won't do, then there is nothing for it but to go to work on the cryptogrammatic plan, which is sufficiently accommodating to prove anything.

The Retreating Dinner Hour.

Just why the hour of more or less fashionable dinner—as distinguished from plain, old-fashioned American supper—should have inched on to the late point where now it rests is one of the all too frequent unsolvable problems in practical sociology. A generation ago it was anywhere from 6 to 7. Now it is nearer 8 than 7, with the later hour as the one really right moment, we have been given to understand.

To a very considerable extent the whole programme of the day has been moved on as well. The lawyers and brokers of New York begin work later, lunch later, and leave later. Courts sit later. Theatre and opera are later. Of course, the great majority of workers are not as much affected; and once the large cities are left behind the old hours hold with less change. But there has been some shifting of the social clock—and in the direction of daylight wasting—all along the line.

England has seen a parallel change. The Georgian dinner hour was from 5 to 6. Theatres opened at 7 in Crimean days. As late as the '70s the dinner hour at Oxford was before 6 in all the colleges. To-day the schedule of fashionable London is later even than ours, and critics of the resurrected daylight-saving plan are pointing to this voluntary shift to prove how little clocks have to do with regulating human habits.

For better or for worse, the larks who delight to arise with the sun seem to be losing ground before the owls, whose eyes are brightest after dark. Is that simply the general way of much civilization? Or is it the effect of successfully perverting nighttime into daytime with electric light? Or is it simply the general cussedness of human nature? The daylight savers have yet to answer.

Our Poor Grasp of Foreign Languages.

(From The Boston Herald.)
The New England Language Association meets to-day in Boston to discuss proposals for securing "better teaching efficiency in modern language instruction," and we shall again have explained to us, along with defects in our educational equipment, some of the reasons why Americans are not "a nation of linguists." There will be emphasis on the natural or "direct," as opposed to the old formal or grammatical, method of acquiring tongues; once more we shall be reminded that the supply of competent teachers runs vastly short of the demand.

The French pedagogues, in their Sorbonne programme, define the object of modern language teaching as "la possession effective de la langue," and that means such knowledge of a foreign tongue as will enable you to use it efficiently in speaking, writing and reading. Why, then, is so much of the energy put into the language classes of our colleges and high schools as good as wasted so far as the students may be said to come out from them with anything like "effective possession"? Can it be maintained that we are too remote from Europe to have either the stimulus or the practice needed for proficiency in this field? We have a Europe in our very midst—whole colonies of people from abroad, each with French, German, Italian, Spanish or Russian for their native speech. Our immigration problem would alone demand first-hand contact with these incomers. Why is not the opportunity better utilized? Is it because we stress the academic uses of foreign languages overmuch? We do need them for travel, and more obviously for the study of Old World literatures. But there is an even more insistent call for them in business, to be heard louder than ever at the close of the

FLEE FATUOUS SECURITY

If the Republicans Do Not, They Cannot Win Election.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: A perfectly level, unbiased and dispassionate look at the situation seems to your correspondent to lead to the conclusion that neither Elihu Root nor Justice Hughes could be elected President of the United States.

In any event, let the Republican party discover and face the facts, fairly and squarely. Let it not blindly follow fatuity. This is no time for "wishing," much less for the destructive animosities and impenetrable prejudices that simply tend to paralyze every hopeful purpose.

The outcome of the approaching Presidential campaign spells Woodrow Wilson, unless the Republican party stops its pussyfooting and cat scratching on the back fence of discord and division, and comes out front, into the open, in the strength and zeal of patriotic, high-minded, harmonious manhood; and unless the Republican party, with generous unanimity, chooses as its standard bearer in the coming campaign some man who can defeat Mr. Wilson.

It seems doubtful indeed if either one of the above mentioned distinguished Republicans could bring about this exceedingly important and desirable result. Whatever their merit, and it is very great, both of them lack the essential element of popularity. Whether we like it or not, the people do the voting.

There is no occasion for questioning the character or standing of these exceptionally eminent lawyers, who in many instances have shown themselves to be astute, broad-minded statesmen, and above reproach. There is no spiteful desire to recall the astounding thing that Mr. Root did in the National Republican Convention of 1912, the bitter sting of which still smartens in the sensitive flesh of hundreds of thousands of Republican voters. It may be wholly unnecessary and ill-advised to dwell upon his life-long, professional representation of "interests" toward which the masses of the people do not bear the best of good will, to say the least. And as to Mr. Justice Hughes, it is probably needless to call attention to his severely being a national figure in any large and compelling sense.

Suffice it to say that neither one touches the popular pulse; that neither one shares notably the popular point of view; that neither one, either by constitutional temperament or practical experience, has come to enter heartily into the spirit and feeling of the masses; and that neither one will get the popular vote to any considerable extent.

And it is utterly, suicidal folly to say, as a well known member of the Union League said to your correspondent only a few days since, that no matter who is the nominee of the Republican party this year he will simply sweep the country against Mr. Wilson. Such a fatuous sense of security will certainly precipitate another Republican disaster.

The Republican nominee, in order to win, must be a tried and proved statesman, of universally recognized vision, strength and ability, who is at the same time truly representative, not of the few, but of the majority of the voters of the country, a man in whom the element of popularity is conspicuous, a man of distinguished leadership, in whom the people have implicit confidence and on whom the country can safely rely.

Therefore let the patriotic Republicans of the nation absolutely sink all narrow, selfish, biased and factional considerations and get together! Let them agree upon such a standard bearer. For national honor, prestige, peace and prosperity are all at stake—and after the war a momentous period of reconstruction, not merely local, but worldwide.

HENRY A. BOMBERGER.
Philadelphia, Penn., May 18, 1916.

Roosevelt or Wilson?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: If the will of the people is allowed to rule, then Theodore Roosevelt will be nominated and elected President. He is the only man who can be elected this year over Wilson. If Roosevelt is not nominated we may as well make up our minds that Wilson will be re-elected.

There is no sentiment here for Hughes, Root or any other than Roosevelt. At the primary in this county Roosevelt got hundreds of votes written on the ballot, while Hughes got just one and Root one or two. Hughes could never get the labor vote if he were nominated, and nobody knows for what he stands.

If the delegation is true blue American then Roosevelt will be nominated by both conventions and will be elected, but if the delegation is pro-German-American or pro-something else than American, then it may nominate some one else and Wilson will be elected with his hands down. Will the delegates do the great, big American thing by nominating the man who can be elected? We will wait and see what kind of Americans have been elected delegates to the convention.

Roosevelt is the only man who can awaken the American people from their sleep into the true patriotic spirit. The American people want Roosevelt for President.

A. A. W.
Huntingdon, Penn., May 29, 1916.

For Preparedness and T. R.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: As to preparedness, I am with T. R., who believes every able-bodied man should be as ready as was our General Putnam, who left his plough in the field, mounted his horse and rode to Boston in '76 to do battle for his country.

I have some of the fighting blood myself. My great-grandfather was a Revolutionary soldier; my grandfather on my father's side rode with his company of "light horse" from Westchester County, N. Y., down to the Connecticut shore when threatened with British invasion in the War of 1812; my father served seven years in the militia of his day, "armed and equipped as the law directs," and my elder brother at nineteen enlisted in a New York regiment and served until invalided home to die.

And now the Republican party, with which I have always voted (they left me in 1912), want a man to unite the party in the coming Presidential election. Is there any other man among the thousands who have had political experience who can give us a strong government and a square deal as outlined in T. R.'s speech at Detroit? I think the handwriting on the wall spells T. R., and if all those regular Republicans can't interpret it they may get left worse off than in 1912.

A CONNECTICUT FARMER.
Brookfield, Conn., May 22, 1916.

Mr. Wilson as Peacemaker.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I don't think either The Tribune or the country generally need worry about the prominent part Mr. Wilson proposes to take in the "peace negotiations." It would seem to simple, direct and unlighted minds that even four years is too much to spend in a college.

The Tribune's editorial this morning is excellent. Keep Mr. Roosevelt's Detroit address before the public. The verbosity and meanness of Mr. Wilson and the direct, manly appeal of Mr. Roosevelt can have but one result next November.

W. T. SMEDLEY.
New York, May 23, 1916.

Whidden Graham's Facts Examined and His Conclusions Questioned.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Whidden Graham, in The Tribune of May 18, complained that an article in The Tribune of April 23 was but "a rehash of the old, stale arguments of the professional prohibition agitators," full of "assertions without foundation in fact."

Against the assertion that the medical profession generally teaches "that alcohol is a poison," Mr. Graham places an assertion by Dr. Jacobi that its use is highly beneficial in the treatment of certain diseases. Strychnine is also used—very carefully—in certain diseases, but strychnine is none the less a poison.

In reply to the assertion that human instinct and experience are against the use of alcohol, Mr. Graham presents the Committee of Fifty's estimate of the proportion of the population which used liquors in the days of its investigations—about twenty years ago. But what answer is a habit to an assertion respecting instinct and experience? People learn to drink.

In opposition to the assertion that "Kansas's average holding of taxable property is the largest of any state in the Union," Mr. Graham puts an assertion which he claims is based on the census of 1910 as to something altogether different—"the per capita wealth," in which he ranks Nebraska ahead of Kansas. On Page 11 of the abstract of Special Census Bulletins on Wealth, Debt and Taxation for 1913 is a table of "Assessed Valuation of All Property Subject to Ad Valorem Taxation," by states and groups of states since 1860. Kansas went dry in 1880. Here are the figures for it and Nebraska since then:

	Kansas.	Nebraska.
1880.....	\$109,891,689	\$90,886,782
1890.....	\$47,717,219	\$54,770,305
1902.....	\$63,163,630	\$80,091,192
1912.....	\$2,746,900,291	\$463,371,889

Mr. Graham says prohibition has nothing to do with the low death rate in Kansas. It is his word against that of W. J. V. Deacon, Registrar of Vital Statistics for Kansas. In reply to an inquiry from the Director of the United States Census as to why the death rate was so low, Mr. Deacon said, on January 10 last: "Because the people do not drink liquor, because they have money enough to live right and because they have the intelligence to read of the conditions that make for short lives and know how to dodge them."

What boots it to compare the death rate in prohibition Maine, a state with an excessive average of aged people because of the young manhood constantly flowing away from it, with Kansas, one of the newer growing states?

To the statement that Kansas "has the fewest homicides and murders of any state," Mr. Graham rejoins that the census of 1910 shows nineteen states with a lower homicide rate than Kansas. The census for 1910 shows no figures covering the homicide rate for Kansas and the rest of the states; neither has any special census bulletin since presented any comparative figures on this point. What Mr. Graham has done is to twist the census figures as to prison populations for homicide in 1910 to a misuse. The number of murderers in state prisons in Kansas in a given year as compared with those in the prisons of other states has no possible relation to the homicide rate in that state. Kansas has no death penalty for murder and sentences to life imprisonment only.

Against the statement as to the number of Kansas paupers in 1913, Mr. Graham places some census figures for 1910 and the statement that at that time fourteen states had a lower pauper rate than Kansas. Mr. Graham did not state, however, that four of that fourteen were already prohibition states and nine of the other ten had more than half of their areas free from saloons at that time; that no state with less than 25 per cent of its territory dry was in the Kansas class, and only one which was more than half wet. Wyoming, a new and incompletely organized state.

To a statement that eighty-seven counties in Kansas had no insane in 1913, Mr. Graham proposes some census figures as to

THE MIRAGE.



"THE RECORD OF PROHIBITION"

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I read in The Tribune of April 19 a report of a meeting of the Spotswood, N. J. Reform Church, of which Rev. Dr. Thomas C. Easton is pastor, in which mention is made of the existence of a "dissension" and of "warring factions" in the congregation. I thought you would be interested to know that the entire consistency of the church, consisting of William H. Hull, Joseph Hodap, Jr., J. W. Van Dyke, W. H. Clark, Thomas J. Brown and William K. Irons have denied that any "dissension" or "warring factions" existed, and have resolved that "there is not a more loving, devoted and united congregation in all our denominations. The annual meeting referred to, held on April 18, was marked for its harmony, and great delight was expressed by all present at the prosperous condition of the church under the leadership of its minister, to well known to our beloved denomination."

H. M. THATCHER.
New York, May 31, 1916.

The War of 1812.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Would you kindly permit me through your columns to suggest to Mrs. Rose Phelps, whose interesting letter appears in your issue of to-day, that it might be well for her to read a very interesting and I believe accurate history of the American people written by one Woodrow Wilson and particularly note the description of the closing scenes connected with the War of the Revolution, so-called. She will then know that England was at war with France and Spain and they were the important factors in the contest so far as England was concerned.

The trouble in America was merely a protracted and widespread riot, in which regular German soldiers serving the King of Hanover, who also happened to be King of England, tried to suppress bands of very efficient snipers whose operations were favored by the wooded conditions of the country. English officers threw up their commissions and English soldiers mutinied rather than assist the King in depriving the colonies of what were considered the rights of freemen. Englishmen, Pitt, Fox and Burke, the Parliamentary leaders of England, denounced the King's action in scathing terms.

The War of 1812, so-called, was merely an incident in the Napoleonic war. The excuse used by the American President to start hostilities was the "right of search" exercised by the English. It is worthy of note that bells were tolled as if for a funeral and flags hung at half-mast in Boston and other New England cities when news of the President's action was published there.

As a matter of fact, Great Britain and the United States have never been at war with each other singly, and as they have the same ideals respecting human rights and civil liberty, let us hope that they will never be in conflict again.

H. B. HETHERINGTON.
New York, May 13, 1916.

A United Congregation.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I read in The Tribune of April 19 a report of a meeting of the Spotswood, N. J. Reform Church, of which Rev. Dr. Thomas C. Easton is pastor, in which mention is made of the existence of a "dissension" and of "warring factions" in the congregation. I thought you would be interested to know that the entire consistency of the church, consisting of William H. Hull, Joseph Hodap, Jr., J. W. Van Dyke, W. H. Clark, Thomas J. Brown and William K. Irons have denied that any "dissension" or "warring factions" existed, and have resolved that "there is not a more loving, devoted and united congregation in all our denominations. The annual meeting referred to, held on April 18, was marked for its harmony, and great delight was expressed by all present at the prosperous condition of the church under the leadership of its minister, to well known to our beloved denomination."

H. M. THATCHER.
New York, May 31, 1916.

CONSISTENCY?

Mrs. Rooney Discusses Cannery Workers' Hours and a Suffrage Referendum.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: At the recent convention of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs a motion was made to send the Governor a telegram urging his veto of a bill, then pending before him, which involved the hours of labor in the canneries during the busy season.

I asked the question: "Have the women of the canneries been heard from as to the hours permitted by the bill?" My purpose was not to take sides on the merits of the bill itself. It seemed to me proper to inquire whether the women engaged in that state matters

work had been consulted.

To my inquiry Mrs. Maud Nathan replied "No."

I now find in your issue of the 14th a letter from Mrs. Maud Nathan in which she refers to the incident and expresses surprise that my "reason for opposing it was that I did not know whether the women employees of the canneries wished the measure passed or not." It seems odd to me, an anti-suffragist, that the proposition that the persons chiefly concerned should be consulted should be laughed to scorn by a suffrage leader like Mrs. Nathan. And yet it is not inconsistent with the suffragists' tactics, as they seek to foist the vote upon the vast majority of women who do not want it. They have been challenged to a woman's referendum in this state and always scornfully refuse it. Women are to get what they want but what the suffrage leaders, professional and otherwise, think the women ought to have.

My critic further says: "She [Mrs. Rooney] stated that she was not in favor of allowing men to legislate for women without giving the women an opportunity to express themselves! Could any more delicious tid-bit of inconsistent anti-suffrage reasoning be found?"

The only inconsistency consists in Mrs. Nathan's own conclusion. The anti-suffragists have never taken the ground that women's interests or women's wishes should not be consulted both in public and in private matters.

Our belief is that they should be, and that in free America they always have been. What we object to is the forcing of women into politics by a small and unrepresentative minority.

MARIE COLLINS ROONEY.
President of the Guidon Club.
New York, May 27, 1916.

Irish Soldiers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In the heat of the present excitement over most unfortunate recent occurrences in Ireland the American must remember the Irish soldiers fighting for the Allies' cause. It is estimated that more than 65 per cent of Great Britain's expeditionary force of 80,000 were Celts. The world knows and civilization and France especially will ever respect and revere their heroic aid. Ypres and Hill No. 60 in Belgium are scarlet with Irish blood. Gallipoli claimed more Irish heroes. Loos, Hulluck and Vimy wept their heads at the dying flower of the gallant Irishmen giving their last drop of blood to nurture civilization's cause. Even the deserts of Mesopotamia bear the scarlet badge of the race which is ever ready when needed.

Nearly 200,000 Irishmen volunteered; many, volunteered from Ireland. How many from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa? Even from here? I don't know! But I know they went.

The many must not suffer for the few. The world praises their courage. Ah, but widows and orphans suffer from all the parent provided! They pray for him, but—Do be generous! All Irish are! Be generous to them now in their need!

JOHN B. O'DONNELL.
Director Irish Section Allied Bazaar.
New York, May 24, 1916.

The Progressives' Offer.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: It appears to the writer that you might well include in your splendid editorials for a reawakened national conscience, but the Progressive party offers to the Republican party "Millions for defence, not one vote for Liberty." The condition—the nomination of Colonel Roosevelt.

W. RICHARD UPSON.
Waterbury, Conn., May 22, 1916.